

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE		FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET N		D. CONFIRMATION NO.
09/509,301	06/13/2000	HAROLD JAY WILLIAM	11750-002001	7680
	03/28/2003			
JOHN F HAY	DEN			
FISH & RICHARDSON			EXAMINER	
600 13TH STREET NW WASHINGTON, DC 20005			BARRY, CHESTER T	
	, = ======		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1724	
			DATE MAILED: 03/28/2003	14

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

X

		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	Offic Action Summary	09/509,301	WILLIAM, HAROLD JAY				
	. One Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	The MAILING DATE of this committed	Chester T. Barry	1724				
ı	The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
	A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE						
-	1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on						
		action is non-final.					
	3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. Disposition of Claims						
	4) Claim(s) is/are pending in the application.						
l	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
	6) Claim(s) is/are rejected.						
	7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
	8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.						
Application Papers							
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.							
ĺ	10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.						
ĺ	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a)						
11) The proposed drawing correction filed on is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.							
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.							
12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.							
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120							
	13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).						
	a) All b) Some * c) None of:						
	1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.						
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No.						
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 							
	14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).						
	a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received. 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.						
Attachment(s)							
2)	Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	5\ Notice of I-	ummary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) formal Patent Application (PTO-152)				

Application/Control Number: 09/509,301

Art Unit: 1724

Claims 1 – 12 are rejected under 35 USC 35 U.S.C. Sec. 102(b) as anticipated by WO 94/00237 to Monash University (published 6 January 1994)(hereinafter "Lawson").

Lawson describes a material comprising an ion exchange material dispersed or distributed within a polyurethane polymer. The polyurethane polymer may be swollen by toluene (page 7 line 36). Accordingly, given the broadest reasonable construction of the claims that is not inconsistent with the specification, Lawson's material is "superabsorbent."

Claims 1 – 12 are rejected under 35 USC §112(2nd) as failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter for which patent protection is sought. The distinction, if there is one, between the Lawson disclosure and the invention of at least claims 1 and 6, lies in a reasonably precise understanding of the distinction between a "superabsorbent" polyurethane foam and other polyurethane foam materials that are not fairly characterized as "superabsorbent." The art of record does not appear to provide a reasonably precise standard by which this distinction may be made with a reasonable degree of certainty. Applicant's specification does not provide a reasonably clear

Page 3

Art Unit: 1724

definition of what applicant regards as a "superabsorbent" polymer in terms that provide the public with fair notice of the metes and bounds of the claimed subject matter.

Respectfully,

Chester T Barry

Examiner

703-306-5921